



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,975	12/12/2001	Eric Rosen	010559	4927
23696	7590	08/07/2006	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			[REDACTED]	FOX, BRYAN J
			[REDACTED]	ART UNIT
			[REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/016,975	ROSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bryan J. Fox	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-69 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The Previous Office Action is vacated. This Office Action will replace the previous Office Action and restart the time period for reply.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 20, 24, 26, 30, 31, 35, 37, 41, 43, 47, 48, 52, 53, 58, 60, 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey (US006449491B1) in view of Hamalainen (US005966378A).

Regarding **claim 1**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that “wins” the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20. A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call”. In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated

with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a controller after the service origination process is complete," and, configuring a communications manager (CM) to not respond immediately to the floor-control request." Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed "the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel".

Regarding **claim 7**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads

on the claimed "method for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a wireless infrastructure after the service origination process is complete". Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey

column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed “the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel”.

Regarding **claim 13**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that “wins” the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed “method for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network”. A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call”. In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “initiating a service origination process for the source communication device”. After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed “transmitting a response to the floor-control request”. Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging.”

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the confirm messages preferably are Fast Associated Control Channel (FACCH) messages (see Dailey column 9, lines 61-65), which reads on the claimed "the transmitting includes transmitting the response on a forward common channel".

Regarding **claim 18**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see Dailey column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see Dailey column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed "computer readable medium embodying a method for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9,

Art Unit: 2617

lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed “transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a controller after the service origination process is complete”. Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging.”

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed “the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel”.

Regarding **claim 24**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that “wins” the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed “computer-readable medium embodying a method for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network”. A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “receiving a floor-

control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a wireless infrastructure after the service origination process is complete". Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 26**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed "the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel".

Regarding **claim 30**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the

originating party that “wins” the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed “computer-readable medium embodying a method for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network”. A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call”. In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “initiating a service origination process for the source communication device”. After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed “transmitting a response to the floor-control request”. Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging.”

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 31**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the confirm messages preferably are Fast Associated Control Channel (FACCH)

messages (see Dailey column 9, lines 61-65), which reads on the claimed "the transmitting includes transmitting the response on a forward common channel".

Regarding **claim 35**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed "apparatus for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "means for receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "means for initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "means for transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a controller after the service origination process is complete". Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 37**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed "the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel".

Regarding **claim 41**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed "apparatus for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "means for receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "means for initiating a service origination process for the source communication

device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "means for transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a wireless infrastructure after the service origination process is complete". Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 43**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed "the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel".

Regarding **claim 47**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed "apparatus for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the

system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "means for receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "means for initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "means for transmitting a response to the floor-control request". Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 48**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the confirm messages preferably are Fast Associated Control Channel (FACCH) messages (see Dailey column 9, lines 61-65), which reads on the claimed "the transmitting includes transmitting the response on a forward common channel".

Regarding **claim 52**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to

Art Unit: 2617

initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed "apparatus for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a controller after the service origination process is complete". Since the system both receives the origination message and transmits the response as discussed above, the system must include a transmitter and a receiver as claimed. Further, the transceiver that has the transmitter and receiver is connected to a cellular radio exchange 614 and a mobility server 616 (see figure 6), and these devices together produce a machine such that the instructions which execute on the computer or other programmable data processing apparatus create means for implementing the functions specified in the flowchart block or blocks (see column 8, lines 7-28), so they must include the "processor communicatively coupled to the

receiver and the transmitter" capable of the functions described above. Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 53**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed "the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel".

Regarding **claim 58**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that "wins" the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed "apparatus for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network". A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call". In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation

message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed "initiating a service origination process for the source communication device". After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed "transmitting a response to the floor-control request from a wireless infrastructure after the service origination process is complete". Since the system both receives the origination message and transmits the response as discussed above, the system must include a transmitter and a receiver as claimed. Further, the transceiver that has the transmitter and receiver is connected to a cellular radio exchange 614 and a mobility server 616 (see figure 6), and these devices together produce a machine such that the instructions which execute on the computer or other programmable data processing apparatus create means for implementing the functions specified in the flowchart block or blocks (see column 8, lines 7-28), so they must include the "processor communicatively coupled to the receiver and the transmitter" capable of the functions described above. Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 60**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56), which reads on the claimed “the receiving includes receiving the floor-control request on a reverse common channel”.

Regarding **claim 64**, Dailey discloses a system with a terminal 400 that includes a push-to-talk button 460, operatively associated with the controller 470 and used to initiate and conduct group calls (see column 7, lines 26-36). This system notifies the originating party that “wins” the traffic channel (see column 10, lines 8-20), which reads on the claimed “apparatus for avoiding simultaneous service origination and paging in a mobile operating in a group communication network”. A group call origination message is transmitted from an originating terminal (Block 705) and is received at one of the system transceiver units (see column 8, lines 38-44 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “receiving a floor-control request from a source communication device for initiating a group call”. In response, the system transmits a traffic channel designation message addressed to terminals in the group associated with the group call origination message (see column 8, lines 44-49 and figure 7), which reads on the claimed “initiating a service origination process for the source communication device”. After designation of the common traffic channel, a confirm message is transmitted to the terminals of the group (see column 9, lines 47-49 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed “transmitting a response to the floor-control request”. Since the system both receives the origination message and transmits the response as discussed above, the system must include a transmitter and a receiver as claimed. Further, the transceiver that has the transmitter

and receiver is connected to a cellular radio exchange 614 and a mobility server 616 (see figure 6), and these devices together produce a machine such that the instructions which execute on the computer or other programmable data processing apparatus create means for implementing the functions specified in the flowchart block or blocks (see column 8, lines 7-28), so they must include the "processor communicatively coupled to the receiver and the transmitter" capable of the functions described above. Dailey fails to expressly disclose avoiding a race condition between the service origination process and paging."

In a similar field of endeavor, Hamalainen discloses preventing collisions between transmissions in the uplink and in the downlink (see column 3, lines 6-14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dailey with Hamalainen to include the above prevention of collisions in order to avoid the loss of data.

Regarding **claim 65**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the confirm messages preferably are Fast Associated Control Channel (FACCH) messages (see Dailey column 9, lines 61-65), which reads on the claimed "the transmitting includes transmitting the response on a forward common channel".

Claims 2, 8, 19, 25, 36, 42, 53 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Hamalainen as applied to claims 1, 7, 18, 24, 35, 41, 52 and 58 above, and further in view of Phillips et al (US005873023A).

Regarding **claims 2, 8, 19, 25, 36, 42, 53 and 59**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to expressly disclose caching the response before sending it.

In a similar field of endeavor, Phillips et al discloses a method for implementing a group call where messages may be queued before transmission (see column 5, lines 10-33). The queuing of a message reads on the claimed “caching”.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen with Phillips et al to include the above queuing of messages in order to avoid loss of information in the case that more than one message is to be sent at the same time or nearly the same time.

Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, 38, 39, 44, 45, 50, 55, 56, 61, 62 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Hamalainen as applied to claims 3, 9, 14, 20, 26, 31, 37, 43, 48, 54, 60 and 65 above, and further in view of Kumar et al (US006507572B1).

Regarding **claims 4, 10, 21, 27, 38, 44, 55 and 61**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56). The combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to expressly disclose the use of the reverse access channel.

In a similar field of endeavor, Kumar et al discloses a system where a mobile makes an access on the RACH at the primary to request channel assignment (see column 16, lines 56-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen with Kumar et al to

include the above use of the RACH in order to be consistent with the standard of using the reverse channel for initial contact.

Regarding **claims 5, 11, 22, 28, 39, 45, 56 and 62**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message is transmitted on a reverse control channel (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56). The combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to expressly disclose the use of the reverse enhanced access channel.

In a similar field of endeavor, Kumar et al discloses a system where a mobile uses the R_EACH to request assignment of a dedicated traffic channel (see column 18, lines 8-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen with Kumar et al to include the above use of the reverse enhanced access channel in order to be consistent with the standard of using the reverse enhanced access channel to request assignment of a dedicated traffic channel.

Regarding **claims 16, 33, 50 and 67**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the confirm messages preferably are Fast Associated Control Channel (FACCH) messages (see Dailey column 9, lines 61-65). The combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to expressly disclose that the forward common control channel is used.

In a similar field of endeavor, Kumar et al discloses a system where a primary responds on the forward common control channel (see column 16, lines 27-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen with Kumar et al to include the above use of the forward common control channel in order to take advantage of the benefits of a common channel, such as resource sharing between many terminals.

Claims 6, 12, 23, 29, 40, 46, 51, 57, 63, 68 and 69 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Hamalainen as applied to claims 3, 9, 20, 26, 37, 43, 48, 54, 60 and 65 above, and further in view of Wang et al (US 20020055364A1).

Regarding **claims 6, 12, 23, 29, 40, 46, 51, 57, 63 and 68**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the group call origination message has a special abbreviated format (see Dailey column 3, lines 52-56). The combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to expressly disclose that the message is in short data burst form.

In a similar field of endeavor, Wang et al discloses a system that uses a short data burst (see figure 2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen with Wang et al to include the above short data burst form in order to minimize the use of system resources by avoiding the need for a longer message.

Regarding **claim 69**, the combination of Dailey, Hamalainen and Wang et al discloses that the terminal 400 includes a push-to-talk button 460 (see Dailey column 7,

lines 26-36), which reads on the claimed “the source communication device includes a push-to-talk (PTT) device”.

Claims 15, 32, 49 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey in view of Hamalainen as applied to claims 14, 31, 48 and 65 above, and further in view of Hunzinger (US 20020082032A1).

Regarding **claims 15, 32, 49 and 66**, the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen discloses that the confirm messages preferably are Fast Associated Control Channel (FACCH) messages (see Dailey column 9, lines 61-65). The combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to disclose that the response is transmitted on a forward paging channel.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hunzinger discloses a system where an acknowledgement is received on the forward paging channel (see paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen with Hunzinger to include the above use of the forward paging channel in order to take advantage of the benefits of a paging channel such as avoiding the need for a dedicated channel, conserving system resources.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues the combination of Dailey and Hamalainen fails to disclose a floor-control request. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The group call origination message disclosed by Dailey (see, e.g. figure 7) reads on the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification of the “floor-control request” claimed by the Applicant.

The Applicant makes similar arguments for the remaining claims, however, for the same reason outlined above, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J. Fox whose telephone number is (571) 272-7908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Bryan Fox
June 8, 2006



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER